

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
at CHATTANOOGA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
) Case No. 1:16-cr-119
v.)
)
KARL HOOD) Judge Mattice
) Magistrate Judge Steger

ORDER

On January 24, 2019, United States Magistrate Judge Christopher H. Steger filed his Report and Recommendation, (Doc. 91), pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and (C). Magistrate Judge Steger recommended a finding pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 4241(d) that “Defendant is **NOT** presently suffering from a mental disease or defect rendering him mentally incompetent to the extent that he is unable to assist properly in his defense.” (Doc. 91 at 10).

Defendant has not objected to Magistrate Judge Steger’s Report and Recommendation.¹ Nevertheless, the Court has reviewed the Magistrate Judge’s findings, as well as the record, and it agrees with his well-reasoned conclusions.

Accordingly:

- The Court **ACCEPTS** and **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Steger’s findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations, (Doc. 91), pursuant to § 636(b)(1)(B) and (C);
- The Court finds Defendant, Karl Hood, is **NOT** presently suffering from a mental disease or defect rendering him mentally incompetent to the extent that he is unable to understand the nature and consequences of the proceedings against him or assist properly in his defense.

¹ Magistrate Judge Steger specifically advised Defendant that he had 14 days in which to object to the Report and Recommendation and that failure to do so would waive his right to appeal. (Doc. 91 at 10 n.1); *see Fed. R. Crim. P. 59(b)(2)*; *see also Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 148-51 (1985) (noting that “[i]t does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate’s factual or legal conclusions, under a *de novo* or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings”).

SO ORDERED this 19th day of February, 2019.

/s/ Harry S. Mattice, Jr.
HARRY S. MATTICE, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE